

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 16, 2006. Pursuant to a restriction requirement, claims 7-15 were pending under consideration and claims 1-6 and 16-24 were withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner rejected all claims under consideration. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

With this amendment, claims 7-9, 13 and 15 are amended, claim 14 is canceled, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

At the top of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title. Applicant has amended the title to be more specific. Therefore, Applicant submits that the objection has been overcome.

On pages 4-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Watkins et al., US Publication No. 2004/0044953 A1 (hereafter "Watkins") in view of Lo et al., US Patent No. 5,758,347 (herein after "Lo"). Of the rejected claims, claim 7 is an independent claim, and claims 8-15 are dependent, either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7.

On pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Watkins teaches all elements of independent claim 7, except for creation of the compacted resource file. The Examiner then asserted that Lo teaches creation of the compacted file. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Watkins teaches separating out resource files from the remainder of the code in an application on an electronic device, such as a cellular telephone. Watkins teaches that all resources for a single application are represented in a resource definition file 5. Fig. 2 of Watkins shows application 30 and resource file 36. Fig. 3 shows resource file 36 in more detail. Resource file 36 is used by application 30 and includes language-specific resources, image resources, etc., all of which are used by application 30. Specifically, Fig. 3 shows that resource file 36 contains resources for multiple languages (English and French being specifically shown). Therefore, it is clear that Watkins teaches that all resources for a single application are contained in a single resource file.

In contrast, independent claim 7 has been amended such that the creation of the compacted resource file includes “reading a control file, wherein the control file specifies at least one compacted resource file and a plurality of resource files that are to be compacted into the at least one compacted resource file, the plurality of resource files being language dependent resource files of a same language and being used by a plurality of different applications....”. The claim goes on to specifically claim generating the headers and the ultimate compacted resource file for the plurality of language dependent resource files that are used by a plurality of different applications.

This is simply neither taught nor suggested by the references cited by the Examiner. As discussed above, Watkins specifically teaches only a single application wherein all of the resources for that single application are contained in a single resource file. Similarly, Watkins specifically teaches that resources for a plurality of different languages are contained in a single resource file. Thus, Watkins cannot teach or suggest a plurality of different language dependent resource files of a same language, and usable by a plurality of different applications, in a single compacted resource file.

Lo does not remedy this deficiency. In fact, Lo is simply drawn to using a storage manager to manage data in different, layered, configurations. It does not teach or suggest storing a plurality of different language dependent resource files of a same language, used by a plurality of different applications, in a single compacted resource file.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 7 is allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant thus submits that dependent claims 8-13, and 15, are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 7.

Applicant further submits that a number of the dependent claims are independently allowable. For instance, claim 13 states that the plurality of resource files that are to be compacted into the compacted resource file “are selected so that the at least one compacted resource file is sized to be a multiple of a minimum memory allocation segment.” To support a rejection of this feature, the Examiner cited Fig. 3 and paragraph 83 of Watkins et al. However, Fig. 3 does not show any indication as to the size of a compacted resource file. There is simply

no indication as to the size of the file shown in Fig. 3, whatsoever. Further, paragraph 83 of Watkins , which was cited by the Examiner to support the rejection, simply states “Fig. 3 shows a schematic representation of the resource file 36 of Fig. 2, and the resource information contained therein.” There is simply no indication as to how the resource file is sized, much less that it is sized to be a multiple of a minimum memory allocation segment.

Dependent claim 15 states that the plurality of resource files that are to be compacted into the compacted resource file “are selected so that language dependent resources of the same language and corresponding to related language specific application components are compacted into the same compacted resource file.” In other words, not only are the resource files that are compacted into the compacted resource file of the same language, but they are used by related language specific application components of the plurality of different applications.

In order to meet this limitation, the Examiner again cited Fig. 3 of Watkins et al. and paragraph 100. However, paragraph 100 simply states “the selected language ID is then used again by the resource file API to change all the prompts used by the handset to the new language. This means that it is possible to add new languages to the system that were not envisaged at the time the original application was written.” While this text does say how new languages can be added, it certainly does not teach or suggest that the resource files in the compacted resource file are of the same language and used by the related application components. In fact, it teaches just the opposite. It teaches that the stored resource files are of different languages. Thus, the cited paragraph teaches away from dependent claim 15. Therefore, Applicant submits that dependent claim 15 is independently allowable over the references cited by the Examiner.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that independent claim 7 is allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 8-13 and 15 are allowable both independently, and by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 7. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7-13 and 15 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847

900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319

Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312